



On a third-order multi-point boundary value problem at resonance [☆]

Zengji Du ^{a,*}, Xiaojie Lin ^b, Weigao Ge ^a

^a Department of Mathematics, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing 100081, People's Republic of China

^b Department of Mathematics, Xuzhou normal University, Xuzhou Jiangsu 221116, People's Republic of China

Received 9 June 2003

Available online 22 September 2004

Submitted by J. Mawhin

Abstract

In this paper, we prove some existence results for a third order multi-point boundary value problem at resonance. Our method is based upon the coincidence degree theory of Mawhin.

© 2004 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Multi-point boundary value problem; Resonance; Coincidence degree theory; Third-order differential equations

1. Introduction

This paper deals with the following third-order ordinary differential equation:

$$x'''(t) = f(t, x(t), x'(t), x''(t)) + e(t), \quad t \in (0, 1), \quad (1.1)$$

with the following boundary value conditions:

$$x(0) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i x(\xi_i), \quad x'(0) = 0, \quad x(1) = \beta x(\eta). \quad (1.2)$$

[☆] Sponsored by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 10371006).

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: duzengji@163.com (Z. Du).

Here $f : [0, 1] \times R^3 \rightarrow R$ is a continuous function, $e \in L^1[0, 1]$, α_i ($1 \leq i \leq m-2$) $\in R$, $\beta \geq 0$, $0 < \xi_1 < \xi_2 < \dots < \xi_{m-2} < 1$, and $\eta \in (0, 1)$.

Similarly in [1,2], for certain boundary condition case such that the linear operator $Lx = x'''(t) = 0$, defined in a suitable Banach space, is invertible, the so-called non-resonance case. Otherwise, the so-called resonance case.

For the non-resonance case, we refer to see [3,10] and the references therein.

For the resonance case, the boundary value problem is approached in several ways. Such as, Ma [7] studied existence and multiplicity results for the boundary value problem

$$x''' + k^2 x' + g(x, x') = p(t), \quad x'(0) = x'(\pi) = x(\eta) = 0. \quad (1.3)$$

by combining the Lyapunov–Schmit procedure with the continuum theory for O-epi maps. In the case $k = 1$, the solvability of (1.3) has been considered by Nagle and Pothoven [9] under the condition that g is bounded on one side. But the more classical method is to decompose the space in the form of a direct sum of subspaces, one of which is $\text{Ker } L$, and then to work with the corresponding projections on these spaces. For instance, Feng [1], Gupta [4,5], and Liu and Yu [6] used this method to study the existence results for some second order multi-point boundary value problems at resonance case.

Inspired by the work of the above papers, in the present article, we use the coincidence degree theory of Mawhin [8] to discuss the existence of solution for third-order multi-point BVP (1.1), (1.2) at resonance case, and establish some existence theorems under nonlinear growth restriction of f .

2. Existence results

First we present some preliminaries needed to understand how the fixed point result of Mawhin [8] is concerned.

Let Y, Z be real Banach spaces and let $L : \text{dom } L \subset Y \rightarrow Z$ be a linear operator which is Fredholm map of index zero and $P : Y \rightarrow Y$, $Q : Z \rightarrow Z$ be continuous projectors such that $\text{Im } P = \text{Ker } L$, $\text{Ker } Q = \text{Im } L$ and $Y = \text{Ker } L \oplus \text{Ker } P$, $Z = \text{Im } L \oplus \text{Im } Q$. It follows that $L|_{\text{dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P} : \text{dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P \rightarrow \text{Im } L$ is invertible, we denote the inverse of that map by K_P . Let Ω be an open bounded subset of Y such that $\text{dom } L \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$, the map $N : Y \rightarrow Z$ is said to be L -compact on $\bar{\Omega}$ if the map $QN(\bar{\Omega})$ is bounded and $K_P(I - Q)N : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow Y$ is compact. For more details we refer the reader to the lecture notes of Mawhin [8].

To obtain our existence results we use the following fixed point theorem of Mawhin [8].

Theorem 2.1. *Let L be a Fredholm operator of index zero and let N be L -compact on $\bar{\Omega}$. Assume that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) $Lx \neq \lambda Nx$ for every $(x, \lambda) \in [(\text{dom } L \setminus \text{Ker } L) \cap \partial\Omega] \times (0, 1)$.
- (ii) $Nx \notin \text{Im } L$ for every $x \in \text{Ker } L \cap \partial\Omega$.
- (iii) $\deg(QN|_{\text{Ker } L}, \Omega \cap \text{Ker } L, 0) \neq 0$, where $Q : Z \rightarrow Z$ is a projection as above with $\text{Im } L = \text{Ker } Q$.

Then the equation $Lx = Nx$ has at least one solution in $\text{dom } L \cap \bar{\Omega}$.

In the following, we shall use the classical spaces $C[0, 1]$, $C^1[0, 1]$, $C^2[0, 1]$, and $L^1[0, 1]$. For $x \in C^2[0, 1]$, we use the norm $\|x\|_\infty = \max_{t \in [0, 1]} |x(t)|$ and $\|x\| = \max\{\|x\|_\infty, \|x'\|_\infty, \|x''\|_\infty\}$, and denote the norm in $L^1[0, 1]$ by $\|\cdot\|_1$. We will use the Sobolev space $W^{3,1}(0, 1)$ which may be defined by

$$W^{3,1}(0, 1) = \{x : [0, 1] \rightarrow R : x, x', x'' \text{ are absolutely continuous on } [0, 1] \\ \text{with } x''' \in L^1[0, 1]\}.$$

Now we prove existence results for BVP (1.1), (1.2) in the following cases:

- (i) $\beta = 1, \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i = 1, \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^2 = 0$;
- (ii) $\beta = 1/\eta^2, \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i = 1, \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^2 = 0$.

Let $Y = C^2[0, 1]$, $Z = L^1[0, 1]$, L is the linear operator from $\text{dom } L \subset Y$ to Z with

$$\text{dom } L = \left\{ x \in W^{3,1}(0, 1) : x(0) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i x(\xi_i), x'(0) = 0, x(1) = \beta x(\eta) \right\}$$

and $Lx = x'''$, $x \in \text{dom } L$. We define $N : Y \rightarrow Z$ by setting

$$Nx = f(t, x(t), x'(t), x''(t)) + e(t), \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Then BVP (1.1), (1.2) can be written as $Lx = Nx$.

Lemma 2.1. *If $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i = 1$, then there exists $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-3\}$, such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^{l+3} \neq 0.$$

Proof. Suppose the assertion fails to be true, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^{l+3} = 0, \quad l = 0, 1, \dots, m-3,$$

we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_1^3 & \xi_2^3 & \cdots & \xi_{m-2}^3 \\ \xi_1^4 & \xi_2^4 & \cdots & \xi_{m-2}^4 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \xi_1^m & \xi_2^m & \cdots & \xi_{m-2}^m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_{m-2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1^3 & \xi_2^3 & \cdots & \xi_{m-2}^3 \\ \xi_1^4 & \xi_2^4 & \cdots & \xi_{m-2}^4 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \xi_1^m & \xi_2^m & \cdots & \xi_{m-2}^m \end{pmatrix} = \xi_1^3 \xi_2^3 \cdots \xi_{m-2}^3 \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \xi_1 & \xi_2 & \cdots & \xi_{m-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \xi_1^{m-3} & \xi_2^{m-3} & \cdots & \xi_{m-2}^{m-3} \end{vmatrix}$$

$$= \left(\prod_{l=1}^{m-2} \xi_l^3 \right) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m-2} (\xi_j - \xi_i) \neq 0,$$

then we have

$$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \cdots = \alpha_{m-2} = 0,$$

which is a contradiction from $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i = 1$. Therefore Lemma 2.1 holds. \square

Lemma 2.2. *If $\beta = 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i = 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^2 = 0$, then $L : \text{dom } L \subset Y \rightarrow Z$ is a Fredholm operator of index zero. Furthermore, the linear continuous projector operator $Q : Z \rightarrow Z$ can be defined by*

$$Qy = \frac{(l+1)(l+2)(l+3)}{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^{l+3}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds \right) t^l,$$

and the linear operator $K_P : \text{Im } L \rightarrow \text{dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P$ can be written by

$$K_P y = -\frac{t^2}{1-\eta^2} \int_\eta^1 \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds + \int_0^t \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds.$$

Furthermore

$$\|K_P y\| \leq \Delta_1 \|y\|_1, \quad \text{for all } y \in \text{Im } L,$$

where $\Delta_1 = (2/(1+\eta)) + 1$.

Proof. It is clear that

$$\text{Ker } L = \{x \in \text{dom } L : x = c, c \in R\}.$$

Now we show that

$$\text{Im } L = \left\{ y \in Z : \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds = 0 \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Since the problem

$$x''' = y \quad (2.2)$$

has a solution $x(t)$ satisfied $x(0) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i x(\xi_i)$, $x'(0) = 0$, $x(1) = \beta x(\eta)$, if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

In fact, if (2.2) has solution $x(t)$ satisfied $x(0) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i x(\xi_i)$, $x'(0) = 0$, $x(1) = \beta x(\eta)$, then from (2.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
x(t) &= x(0) + x'(0)t + \frac{1}{2}x''(0)t^2 + \int_0^t \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds \\
&= x(0) + \frac{1}{2}x''(0)t^2 + \int_0^t \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds.
\end{aligned}$$

According to $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i = 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^2 = 0$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds = 0.$$

On the other hand, if (2.3) holds, setting

$$x(t) = c - \frac{t^2}{1-\eta^2} \int_\eta^1 \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds + \int_0^t \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds,$$

where c is an arbitrary constant, then $x(t)$ is a solution of (2.2), and $x(0) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i x(\xi_i)$, $x'(0) = 0$, $x(1) = \beta x(\eta)$. Hence (2.1) holds.

For $y \in Z$, taking the projector

$$Qy = \frac{(l+1)(l+2)(l+3)}{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^{l+3}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds \right) t^l.$$

Let $y_1 = y - Qy$, we obtain that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y_1(v) dv d\tau ds = 0,$$

then $y_1 \in \text{Im } L$. Hence $Z = \text{Im } L + R$, since $\text{Im } L \cap R = \{0\}$, we have $Z = \text{Im } L \oplus R$, thus

$$\dim \text{Ker } L = \dim R = \text{codim Im } L = 1.$$

Hence L is a Fredholm operator of index zero.

Taking $P: Y \rightarrow Y$ as follows:

$$Px = x(0),$$

then the generalized inverse $K_P: \text{Im } L \rightarrow \text{dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P$ of L can be written by

$$K_P y = -\frac{t^2}{1-\eta^2} \int_\eta^1 \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds + \int_0^t \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds.$$

In fact, for $\forall y \in \text{Im } L$, we have

$$(LK_P)y(t) = [(K_P y)(t)]''' = y(t),$$

and for $x \in \text{dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P$, we know

$$\begin{aligned}(K_P L)x(t) &= -\frac{t^2}{1-\eta^2} \int_{\eta}^1 \int_0^s \int_0^{\tau} x'''(v) dv d\tau ds + \int_0^t \int_0^s \int_0^{\tau} x'''(v) dv d\tau ds \\ &= -\frac{t^2}{1-\eta^2} \left[x(1) - x(\eta) - x'(0)(1-\eta) - \frac{1}{2}x''(0)(1-\eta^2) \right] \\ &\quad + x(t) - x(0) - x'(0)t - \frac{1}{2}x''(0)t^2,\end{aligned}$$

in view of $x \in \text{dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P$, $x'(0) = 0$, $x(1) = x(\eta)$, and $Px = x(0) = 0$, thus

$$(K_P L)x(t) = x(t).$$

This shows that $K_P = (L|_{\text{dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P})^{-1}$. Also we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|K_P y\|_{\infty} &\leq \frac{1}{1-\eta^2} \int_{\eta}^1 \int_0^s \int_0^{\tau} |y(v)| dv d\tau ds + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |y(v)| dv d\tau ds \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{1+\eta} + 1 \right) \|y\|_1 \leq \Delta_1 \|y\|_1,\end{aligned}$$

and from

$$\begin{aligned}(K_P y)'(t) &= -\frac{2t}{1-\eta^2} \int_{\eta}^1 \int_0^s \int_0^{\tau} y(v) dv d\tau ds + \int_0^t \int_0^{\tau} y(v) dv d\tau, \\ (K_P y)''(t) &= -\frac{2}{1-\eta^2} \int_{\eta}^1 \int_0^s \int_0^{\tau} y(v) dv d\tau ds + \int_0^t y(v) dv,\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|(K_P y)'\|_{\infty} &\leq \frac{2}{1-\eta^2} \int_{\eta}^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |y(v)| dv d\tau ds + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |y(v)| dv d\tau = \Delta_1 \|y\|_1, \\ \|(K_P y)''\|_{\infty} &\leq \frac{2}{1-\eta^2} \int_{\eta}^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |y(v)| dv d\tau ds + \int_0^1 |y(v)| dv = \Delta_1 \|y\|_1,\end{aligned}$$

then $\|K_P y\| \leq \Delta_1 \|y\|_1$. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.2. \square

Theorem 2.2. Let $f : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function, assume that

(A₁) There exist functions $a, b, c, d, r \in L^1[0, 1]$, and constant $\theta \in [0, 1]$, such that for all $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $t \in [0, 1]$, either

$$|f(t, x, y, z)| \leq a(t)|x| + b(t)|y| + c(t)|z| + d(t)|z|^{\theta} + r(t), \quad (2.4)$$

or

$$|f(t, x, y, z)| \leq a(t)|x| + b(t)|y| + c(t)|z| + d(t)|y|^\theta + r(t), \quad (2.5)$$

or else

$$|f(t, x, y, z)| \leq a(t)|x| + b(t)|y| + c(t)|z| + d(t)|x|^\theta + r(t). \quad (2.6)$$

(A₂) There exists a constant $M > 0$, such that for $x \in \text{dom } L$, if $|x(t)| > M$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, x(v), x'(v), x''(v)) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds \neq 0. \quad (2.7)$$

(A₃) There exists a constant $M^* > 0$, such that for $c \in \mathbb{R}$, if $|c| > M^*$, then either

$$c \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, c, 0, 0) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds < 0, \quad (2.8)$$

or else

$$c \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, c, 0, 0) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds > 0. \quad (2.9)$$

Then for every $e \in L^1[0, 1]$, the BVP (1.1), (1.2) with $\beta = 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i = 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^2 = 0$ has at least one solution in $C^2[0, 1]$ provided that

$$\|a\|_1 + \|b\|_1 + \|c\|_1 < \frac{1}{\Delta_2},$$

where $\Delta_2 = \Delta_1 + 1$, Δ_1 as in Lemma 2.2.

Proof. We divide the proof into the following steps.

Step 1. Let

$$\Omega_1 = \{x \in \text{dom } L \setminus \text{Ker } L: Lx = \lambda Nx \text{ for some } \lambda \in [0, 1]\}.$$

Then Ω_1 is bounded.

Suppose that $x \in \Omega_1$, $Lx = \lambda Nx$, thus $\lambda \neq 0$, $Nx \in \text{Im } L = \text{Ker } Q$, hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, x(v), x'(v), x''(v)) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds = 0,$$

thus, from (A₂), there exists $t_0 \in [0, 1]$, such that $|x(t_0)| < M$, in view of $x(0) = x(t_0) - \int_0^{t_0} x'(t) dt$, we obtain

$$|x(0)| \leq M + \|x'\|_\infty. \quad (2.10)$$

From $x(1) = \beta x(\eta) = x(\eta)$, there exists $t_1 \in (\eta, 1)$, such that $x'(t_1) = 0$, thus from $x'(t) = x'(t_1) + \int_{t_1}^t x''(t) dt$, one has

$$\|x'\|_{\infty} \leq \|x''\|_1. \quad (2.11)$$

Again from $x'(0) = x'(t_1) = 0$, there exists $t_2 \in (0, t_1)$, such that $x''(t_2) = 0$, thus from $x''(t) = x''(t_2) + \int_{t_2}^t x'''(t) dt$, we obtain

$$\|x''\|_{\infty} \leq \|x'''\|_1, \quad (2.12)$$

hence from (2.10), (2.11), and (2.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Px\| = |x(0)| &\leq M + \|x'\|_{\infty} \leq M + \|x''\|_1 \leq M + \|x''\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq M + \|x'''\|_1 = M + \|Lx\|_1 \leq M + \|Nx\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Again for $x \in \Omega_1$, $x \in \text{dom } L \setminus \text{Ker } L$, then $(I - P)x \in \text{dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P$, $LPx = 0$, thus from Lemma 2.2, we know

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I - P)x\| &= \|K_P L(I - P)x\| \leq \Delta_1 \|L(I - P)x\|_1 = \Delta_1 \|Lx\|_1 \\ &\leq \Delta_1 \|Nx\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

From (2.13) and (2.14), we have

$$\|x\| \leq \|Px\| + \|(I - P)x\| = |x(0)| + \|(I - P)x\| \leq \Delta_2 \|Nx\|_1 + M. \quad (2.15)$$

If (2.4) holds, then from (2.15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\| &\leq \Delta_2 \left[\|a\|_1 \|x\|_{\infty} + \|b\|_1 \|x'\|_{\infty} + \|c\|_1 \|x''\|_{\infty} + \|d\|_1 \|x''\|_{\infty}^{\theta} + \|r\|_1 + \|e\|_1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{M}{\Delta_2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Thus, from $\|x\|_{\infty} \leq \|x\|$ and (2.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\|_{\infty} &\leq \frac{\Delta_2}{1 - \Delta_2 \|a\|_1} \left[\|b\|_1 \|x'\|_{\infty} + \|c\|_1 \|x''\|_{\infty} + \|d\|_1 \|x''\|_{\infty}^{\theta} + \|r\|_1 + \|e\|_1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{M}{\Delta_2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

From $\|x'\|_{\infty} \leq \|x\|$, (2.16) and (2.17), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|x'\|_{\infty} &\leq \|x\| \\ &\leq \Delta_2 \left[1 + \frac{\Delta_2 \|a\|_1}{1 - \Delta_2 \|a\|_1} \right] \\ &\quad \times \left[\|b\|_1 \|x'\|_{\infty} + \|c\|_1 \|x''\|_{\infty} + \|d\|_1 \|x''\|_{\infty}^{\theta} + \|r\|_1 + \|e\|_1 + \frac{M}{\Delta_2} \right] \\ &= \frac{\Delta_2}{1 - \Delta_2 \|a\|_1} \\ &\quad \times \left[\|b\|_1 \|x'\|_{\infty} + \|c\|_1 \|x''\|_{\infty} + \|d\|_1 \|x''\|_{\infty}^{\theta} + \|r\|_1 + \|e\|_1 + \frac{M}{\Delta_2} \right], \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|x'\|_\infty &\leq \frac{\Delta_2}{1 - \Delta_2(\|a\|_1 + \|b\|_1)} \\ &\quad \times \left[\|c\|_1 \|x''\|_\infty + \|d\|_1 \|x''\|_\infty^\theta + \|r\|_1 + \|e\|_1 + \frac{M}{\Delta_2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

Again from $\|x''\|_\infty \leq \|x\|$, (2.16), (2.17), and (2.18), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|x''\|_\infty &\leq \|x\| \leq \left[\Delta_2 \|b\|_1 + \frac{\Delta_2^2 \|a\|_1 \|b\|_1}{1 - \Delta_2 \|a\|_1} \right] \|x'\|_\infty \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{\Delta_2^2 \|a\|_1}{1 - \Delta_2 \|a\|_1} + \Delta_2 \right] \\ &\quad \times \left[\|c\|_1 \|x''\|_\infty + \|d\|_1 \|x''\|_\infty^\theta + \|r\|_1 + \|e\|_1 + \frac{M}{\Delta_2} \right] \\ &\leq \left[\frac{\Delta_2^2 \|b\|_1}{(1 - \Delta_2(\|a\|_1 + \|b\|_1))(1 - \Delta_2 \|a\|_1)} + \frac{\Delta_2}{1 - \Delta_2 \|a\|_1} \right] \\ &\quad \times \left[\|c\|_1 \|x''\|_\infty + \|d\|_1 \|x''\|_\infty^\theta + \|r\|_1 + \|e\|_1 + \frac{M}{\Delta_2} \right] \\ &= \frac{\Delta_2}{1 - \Delta_2(\|a\|_1 + \|b\|_1)} \\ &\quad \times \left[\|c\|_1 \|x''\|_\infty + \|d\|_1 \|x''\|_\infty^\theta + \|r\|_1 + \|e\|_1 + \frac{M}{\Delta_2} \right], \\ \|x''\|_\infty &\leq \frac{\Delta_2 \|d\|_1}{1 - \Delta_2(\|a\|_1 + \|b\|_1 + \|c\|_1)} \|x''\|_\infty^\theta \\ &\quad + \frac{\Delta_2}{1 - \Delta_2(\|a\|_1 + \|b\|_1 + \|c\|_1)} \left[\|r\|_1 + \|e\|_1 + \frac{M}{\Delta_2} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

since $\theta \in [0, 1)$, from (2.19), there exist $M_1 > 0$, such that

$$\|x''\|_\infty \leq M_1, \quad (2.20)$$

thus from (2.20) and (2.18), there exist $M_2 > 0$, such that

$$\|x'\|_\infty \leq M_2, \quad (2.21)$$

therefore from (2.21) and (2.17), there exist $M_3 > 0$, such that

$$\|x\|_\infty \leq M_3, \quad (2.22)$$

hence

$$\|x\| = \max\{\|x\|_\infty, \|x'\|_\infty, \|x''\|_\infty\} \leq \max\{M_1, M_2, M_3\}.$$

Again from (2.4), (2.20), (2.21), and (2.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x'''\|_1 &= \|Lx\|_1 \leq \|Nx\|_1 \\ &\leq \|a\|_1 M_3 + \|b\|_1 M_2 + (\|c\|_1 + \|d\|_1) M_1 + \|r\|_1 + \|e\|_1 := M_4. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we show that Ω_1 is bounded.

If (2.5) or (2.6) holds, similar to the above argument, we can prove Ω_1 is bounded too.

Step 2. The set $\Omega_2 = \{x \in \text{Ker } L: Nx \in \text{Im } L\}$ is bounded.

Let $x \in \Omega_2$, $x \in \text{Ker } L = \{x \in \text{dom } L: x = c, c \in R\}$, and $QNx = 0$, thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, c, 0, 0) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds = 0.$$

From (A₂), $\|x\|_\infty = |c| \leq M$, so $\|x\| = |c| \leq M$, thus Ω_2 is bounded.

Step 3. If the first part of the condition (A₃) holds, that is, there exists $M^* > 0$, such that for any $c \in R$, if $|c| > M^*$, then

$$c \cdot \frac{(l+1)(l+2)(l+3)}{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^{l+3}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, c, 0, 0) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds \right) t^l < 0. \quad (2.23)$$

Let

$$\Omega_3 = \{x \in \text{Ker } L: -\lambda Jx + (1-\lambda)QNx = 0, \lambda \in [0, 1]\},$$

here $J: \text{Ker } L \rightarrow \text{Im } Q$ is the linear isomorphism given by $J(c) = c$, $\forall c \in R$. Then Ω_3 is bounded.

Since for $x = c_0 \in \Omega_3$, then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda c_0 &= (1-\lambda) \cdot \frac{(l+1)(l+2)(l+3)}{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^{l+3}} \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, c, 0, 0) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds \right) t^l. \end{aligned}$$

If $\lambda = 1$, then $c_0 = 0$. Otherwise, if $|c_0| > M^*$, in view of (2.23), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda c_0^2 &= c_0 \cdot (1-\lambda) \cdot \frac{(l+1)(l+2)(l+3)}{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^{l+3}} \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, c, 0, 0) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds \right) t^l < 0, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts $\lambda c_0^2 \geq 0$. Then $|x| = |c_0| \leq M^*$, we obtain $\|x\| \leq M^*$, thus $\Omega_3 \subset \{x \in \text{Ker } L: \|x\| \leq M^*\}$ is bounded.

Step 4. If the second part of the condition (A₃) holds, that is, there exists $M^* > 0$, such that for any $c \in R$, if $|c| > M^*$, then

$$c \cdot \frac{(l+1)(l+2)(l+3)}{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^{l+3}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, c, 0, 0) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds \right) t^l > 0. \quad (2.24)$$

Let

$$\Omega_3 = \{x \in \text{Ker } L : \lambda Jx + (1 - \lambda)QNx = 0, \lambda \in [0, 1]\},$$

here J as in Step 3. Similar to the above argument, we can verify that Ω_3 is bounded.

In the following, we shall prove that all the conditions of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied.

Let Ω be a bounded open subset of Y such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^3 \bar{\Omega}_i \subset \Omega$. By the Ascoli–Arzela theorem, we can show that $K_P(I - Q)N : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow Y$ is compact, thus N is L -compact on $\bar{\Omega}$. Then by the above argument, we have

- (i) $Lx \neq \lambda Nx$ for every $(x, \lambda) \in [(\text{dom } L \setminus \text{Ker } L) \cap \partial\Omega] \times (0, 1)$.
- (ii) $Nx \notin \text{Im } L$ for every $x \in \text{Ker } L \cap \partial\Omega$.
- (iii) Let

$$H(x, \lambda) = \pm \lambda Jx + (1 - \lambda)QNx.$$

According to the above argument, we know $H(x, \lambda) \neq 0$, for $x \in \text{Ker } L \cap \partial\Omega$. Thus, by the homotopy property of degree, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(QN|_{\text{Ker } L}, \Omega \cap \text{Ker } L, 0) &= \deg(H(\cdot, 0), \Omega \cap \text{Ker } L, 0) \\ &= \deg(H(\cdot, 1), \Omega \cap \text{Ker } L, 0) \\ &= \deg(\pm J, \Omega \cap \text{Ker } L, 0) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Theorem 2.1, $Lx = Nx$ has at least one solution in $\text{dom } L \cap \bar{\Omega}$, so that the BVP (1.1), (1.2) has at least one solution in $C^2[0, 1]$. The proof is completed. \square

By using the same method as in the proof of Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 2.2, we can show the following Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 2.3.

Lemma 2.3. *If $\beta = 1/\eta^2$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i = 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^2 = 0$, then $L : \text{dom } L \subset Y \rightarrow Z$ is a Fredholm operator of index zero. Furthermore, the linear continuous projector operator $Q : Z \rightarrow Z$ can be defined by*

$$Qy = \frac{(l+1)(l+2)(l+3)}{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^{l+3}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds \right) t^l,$$

and the linear operator $K_P : \text{Im } L \rightarrow \text{dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P$ can be written by

$$\begin{aligned} K_P y &= \frac{1}{\beta - 1} \left[\int_0^1 \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds - \beta \int_0^\eta \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds \right] \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds. \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\|K_P\| \leq \frac{1}{1-\eta} \|y\|_1, \quad \text{for all } y \in \text{Im } L.$$

Notice that the

$$\text{Ker } L = \{x \in \text{dom } L: x = ct^2, \quad c \in R, \quad t \in [0, 1]\},$$

$$\text{Im } L = \left\{ y \in Z: \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau y(v) dv d\tau ds = 0 \right\},$$

and

$$\|K_P y\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\beta-1} [\|y\|_1 + \beta\eta \|y\|_1] + \|y\|_1 = \frac{1}{1-\eta} \|y\|_1.$$

Theorem 2.3. Let $f: [0, 1] \times R^3 \rightarrow R$ be a continuous function, assume that the condition (A_1) in Theorem 2.2 is satisfied and:

(A_4) There exists a constant $M > 0$, such that for $x \in \text{dom } L$, if $|x''(t)| > M$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, x(v), x'(v), x''(v)) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds \neq 0.$$

(A_5) There exists a constant $M^* > 0$, such that for $c \in R$, if $|c| > M^*$, then either

$$c \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, ct^2, 2cv, 2c) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds < 0,$$

or else

$$c \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^{\xi_i} \int_0^s \int_0^\tau [f(v, ct^2, 2cv, 2c) + e(v)] dv d\tau ds > 0.$$

Then for every $e \in L^1[0, 1]$, the BVP (1.1), (1.2) with $\beta = 1/\eta^2$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i = 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \xi_i^2 = 0$ has at least one solution in $C^2[0, 1]$ provided that

$$\|a\|_1 + \|b\|_1 + \|c\|_1 < \frac{2-\eta}{1-\eta}.$$

Acknowledgment

The authors express their thanks to the referee for his or her very valuable suggestions.

References

- [1] W. Feng, J.R.L. Webb, Solvability of m -point boundary value problems with nonlinear growth, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 212 (1997) 467–480.
- [2] W. Feng, J.R.L. Webb, Solvability of three-point boundary value problems at resonance, *Nonlinear Anal. Theory Meth. Appl.* 30 (1997) 3227–3238.
- [3] M.D.R. Grossinho, F.M. Minhós, Existence result for some third order separated boundary value problems, *Nonlinear Anal. Theory Meth. Appl.* 47 (2001) 2407–2418.
- [4] C.P. Gupta, Solvability of multi-point boundary value problems at resonance, *Results Math.* 28 (1995) 270–276.
- [5] C.P. Gupta, A second order m -point boundary value problem at resonance, *Nonlinear Anal. Theory Meth. Appl.* 24 (1995) 1483–1489.
- [6] B. Liu, J.S. Yu, Solvability of multi-point boundary value problem at resonance (III), *Appl. Math. Comput.* 129 (2002) 119–143.
- [7] R.Y. Ma, Multiplicity results for a third order value problem at resonance, *Nonlinear Anal. Theory Meth. Appl.* 32 (1998) 493–499.
- [8] J. Mawhin, Topological degree methods in nonlinear boundary value problems, NSFCBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1979.
- [9] R.K. Nagle, K.L. Poehoven, On a third-order nonlinear boundary value problems at resonance, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 195 (1995) 148–159.
- [10] E. Rovderová, Third-order boundary value problem with nonlinear boundary conditions, *Nonlinear Anal. Theory Meth. Appl.* 25 (1995) 473–485.